

Serial No.: 10/792,157

Filing Date: 3/3/2004

Attorney Docket No. 143.008US01

Title: A DISTRIBUTED SOFTWARE FABRICATION SYSTEM AND PROCESS FOR
FABRICATING BUSINESS APPLICATIONS

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 16, and 22 are currently amended. The specification has been amended to correct minor typographical errors, for clarity, and to provide consistency with the claim amendments. No new matter is added by the amendments.

Reconsideration of the present claims is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The term “XInternet” is well known to those skilled in the art as an IT term first published by Forester Research in October 2000. XInternet stands for “eXecutable Internet” and proposes a dynamic Rich Internet Application (RIA) as opposed to Internet static web pages. Rich Internet Application minimizes web page refreshes and therefore increases the web application level of conviviality while providing faster response time for a much better user experience. An appropriate description of the term XInternet has been added to page 3 of the specification.

In addition, Applicants disagree with the treatment of the term “XInternet” as the well-known Internet by the Examiner, and kindly asks the Examiner to treat the term XInternet according to the definition provided by Applicants.

Accordingly, claims 1-25 are not indefinite, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/792,157

Filing Date: 3/3/2004

Attorney Docket No. 143.008US01

Title: A DISTRIBUTED SOFTWARE FABRICATION SYSTEM AND PROCESS FOR
FABRICATING BUSINESS APPLICATIONS

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11, 13-16, and 18-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,601,234 to Bowman-Amuah (hereafter "*Bowman-Amuah*"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The claims have been amended as follows: the expressions "online" and "offline, said code" have been added to claim 1; the expression "online" has been added to independent claim 16; and the expressions "online" and "offline" have been added to independent claim 22. These amendments are supported by the present application as filed.

There is no teaching or suggestion in *Bowman-Amuah* of all the limitations now recited in claims 1, 16, and 22. In particular, there is no teaching of the "online" and "offline" limitations recited in present claims 1 and 22. There is also no teaching or suggestion in *Bowman-Amuah* of a business application user interface that relies on a "XInternet one web page application pattern," as recited in claim 16. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Bowman-Amuah* of a business application compatible with "XInternet technologies" as recited in claims 1, 16, and 22, according to the definition of "XInternet" provided by Applicants.

Accordingly, claims 1, 16, and 22 are not anticipated by *Bowman-Amuah*. Since claims 2-11 and 13-15 depend from claim 1, claims 18-21 depend from independent claim 16, and claims 23-25 depend from independent claim 22, each of these dependent claims include the limitations of the respective independent claim. Thus, each of these dependent claims is also not anticipated by *Bowman-Amuah* for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, and 22.

In addition, with respect to claim 5, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Bowman-Amuah* of a business application user interface that relies on a "XInternet one web page application pattern," as recited in claim 5. Accordingly, claim 5 is not anticipated by *Bowman-Amuah* for this additional reason.

Serial No.: 10/792,157

Filing Date: 3/3/2004

Attorney Docket No. 143.008US01

Title: A DISTRIBUTED SOFTWARE FABRICATION SYSTEM AND PROCESS FOR
FABRICATING BUSINESS APPLICATIONS

Applicants note that the software fabrication process (SFP) according to the present invention is a strategic process that automatically generates dynamic e-business application generic structures based on business models and requirements, and greatly improves business strategic alignment between information technology departments and business unit objectives.

The system of the present invention has been designed to build web applications able to replicate desktop software performance. The unique online SFP of the present invention is very different from a regular desktop software development process (SDP). The presently claimed invention makes extensive use of groundbreaking Web 2.0 technologies (AJAX: Asynchronous JavaScript and XML) that are combined with an innovative One Web Page Application (OWPA) pattern, which provides desktop application look and feel over the Internet.

In contrast, regular data management application software development process steps typically comprise seven steps, done from desktop software, which are described in *Bowman-Amuah* as: 1) analyze; 2) design; 3) model; 4) test; 5) build; 6) operate; and 7) evolve. While the presently claimed invention SFP includes regular development process steps, it also adds some new and innovative elements to the process.

For instance, the presently claimed invention allows an analyst to do the Web application needs analysis by designing and documenting an application UML model. When the analyst wants to preview the AJAX Application from the UML model, the analyst uses a first code generator to automatically generate the AJAX application prototype to be previewed and tried online without any manual coding. The prototype provides a unique dynamic database simulation.

The application UML model is automatically generated, within seconds, producing a complete and working prototype of the AJAX application. A business user can instantly try it online from his or her own computer, and can validate the application prototype and approve business rule documentations. The business user is able to enter application data and use the application's Insert, Update, Delete and Save operations on

Serial No.: 10/792,157

Filing Date: 3/3/2004

Attorney Docket No. 143.008US01

Title: A DISTRIBUTED SOFTWARE FABRICATION SYSTEM AND PROCESS FOR
FABRICATING BUSINESS APPLICATIONS

all application entities almost like the finished application will do. When the business user accepts the AJAX application UML model with matching AJAX application prototype, an architect uses a second code generator to automatically generate offline a full AJAX/.NET application code for the developer to download from the Internet. This is a great advantage of the present invention and is not taught or suggested in *Bowman-Amuah*.

Once the application code is downloaded, an offline development process can continue with the downloaded application code generated by the presently claimed invention. The application can then be deployed on an enterprise server, and users can operate the application. The present invention can also be reused to evolve an application for new business needs.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-11, 13-16, and 18-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bowman-Amuah* in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0117759 to Rippert et al. (hereafter "*Rippert*"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Since claim 12 depends from claim 1, and claim 17 depends from independent claim 16, each of these dependent claims include the limitations of the respective independent claim. As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Bowman-Amuah* of all the limitations now recited in claims 1 and 16. There is also no teaching or suggestion in *Rippert* of the missing limitations recited in present claims 1 and 16. Thus, even if the teachings of the references are combined as suggested by the Examiner, not all of the limitations of claims 1 and 16 are met.

Accordingly, claims 12 and 17 would not have been obvious over *Bowman-Amuah* in view of *Rippert*. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/792,157

Filing Date: 3/3/2004

Attorney Docket No. 143.008US01

Title: A DISTRIBUTED SOFTWARE FABRICATION SYSTEM AND PROCESS FOR
FABRICATING BUSINESS APPLICATIONS

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 31, 2007

/Gregory M. Taylor/

Gregory M. Taylor
Reg. No. 34,263Attorneys for Applicants
Fogg & Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731